

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on July 17, 2003. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and that interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-41 remain in this application.

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sasmazel *et al.* (U.S. 6,032,260). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites both an "electronic ticket" element and a "network electronic ticket" element as subelements of a network-linked electronic ticket. As discussed at the interview, claim 1 specifically recites that the "electronic ticket" is for "providing a customer access to a **commodity** or a **service** from a provider" (lines 3-5). Sasmazel does not teach any use of its "eticket" for providing a customer access to a commodity or a service. Hence, claim 1 is patentable over the reference. At the personal interview, the Examiner agreed to review Sasmazel for such a teaching, which applicant has not found in the reference.

Claim 1 further recites that the "network electronic ticket" is for "providing the customer access to online information *about* the commodity or service from an information providing apparatus on a network" (lines 7-10). Sasmazel also does not teach this limitation of claim 1 either.

Instead, Sasmazel teaches an "authentication server 350" for *authenticating* a user and *issuing* a single eticket in response to a successful authorization (col. 7, lines 1-5). Sasmazel also teaches an authorization server 360 which uses information on the thus issued single eticket to provide *access rights* (which is not suggested to be a commodity or a service) to the authenticated user (col. 7, lines 5-13). Thus, Sasmazel teaches but one "eticket" that is used solely for *authenticating* requested access for authorized user (*id.*; see also FIG. 7). The operation could be

a request to view a web page or a protected document, for example (FIG. 7 and accompanying text). Nowhere, however, does Sasmazel suggest using an eticket for obtaining a *service* or a *commodity*, such as is typically done using a paper ticket. Thus, Sasmazel's use of the term "eticket" is a misnomer, for it is never suggested to be in any way analogous to a paper ticket. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the reference.

Claim 17 recites limitations similar to those discussed for claim 1, and thus claim 17 is also patentable over the reference for the same reasons discussed for claim 1. Claims 2-16, which depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1 and claims 18-36, which depend, directly or indirectly on claim 17, are all patentable over the references for the same reasons as their parent claims (as well as for the limitations contained therein).

Claims 38 and 39 also contain limitations similar to those of claim 1, and thus those claims are patentable over the reference for the same reasons discussed for claim 1, above.

Further, claim 39 recites a "mobile user terminal for communicating with the service server for purchasing the networked-linked electronic ticket" (lines 13-15) an "information server for communicating with the mobile user terminal for checking the network electronic ticket before providing information to the mobile user terminal via the public network" (lines 16-19) and a

gate terminal for communicating with the mobile user terminal and for automatically checking the electronic ticket before providing the customer access to the commodity, the service, and/or user admission to the event

(lines 20-25). None of these elements are suggested anywhere in the Sasmazel reference, and thus claim 39 is patentable over the references for this additional reason. Claims 40 and 41, being directly or indirectly dependent on claim 39, are patentable for the same reasons as claim 39 (as well as for the limitations contained therein).

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby

• Appl. No. 09/616,652
Amdt. Dated July 29, 2003
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2003

requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32808.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

526 Superior Avenue, East
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484
(216) 579-1700

July 29, 2003